

# **SCAAC Meeting Summary and Minutes**

## **(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)**

November 14, 2003  
State Board Room  
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

### **Committee Members:**

Margie T. Bradford Kay Freeland Suzanne Guyer Varetta D. Hurt Benny Lile, Chairman Gary Mielcarek	Eleanor Mills Henry Ormsby Roger Pankratz Robert Sexton Linda Sheffield H. M. Snodgrass	Nancy S. Sutton Roxie R. Tempus J. Maynard Thomas, Vice-Chairman  Two (2) Open Positions
--	--	--

### **SCAAC Agenda**

	<b>Agenda Items</b>	<b>Presenters</b>
	<b>Call to Order</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Roll Call</b>	<b>Roger Ervin</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)</b> <b>a. Status update since September 12 Council Meeting</b> <b>b. Status of 2003 NCLB Assessment Results Reporting to Schools and Districts</b> <b>c. Test Administration and Timely Score Reporting</b> <b>d. Council review of definitions of Academic Year, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), Participate Rate, Annual Measure Objectives (AMO) and Confidence Intervals</b> <b>e. Proposed KBE Regulations for Council Review</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Formulate technical and other questions for comment by National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA)</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>

4.	<b>Telephone Conference Call with NTAPAA Committee Members</b>	<b>NTAPAA</b>
5.	<b>Commonwealth Accountability Testing System Spring 2003 School and District Results</b>	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
6.	<b>Setting of 2003-2004 Council Meeting Schedule</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
<b>Adjournment</b>		

*Presenters:*

Cindy Owen, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education

Scott Trimble, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education

*Presenters via Telephone:*

James Catterall, National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA)

John Poggio, , National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA)

*In Attendance:*

Kentucky Department of Education: Roger Ervin, Robin Thompson

Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer

Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney

**Call to Order****Benny Lile**

Chairperson Benny Lile greeted members at 9:06 a.m. Benny outlined meeting activities including a 1:00 pm conference call with National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA).

**1. Roll Call****Roger Ervin**

With a quorum of council members present, the meeting was called to order at 9:12 a.m. The membership roll was called with the following twelve members present:

Margie T. Bradford  
Kay Freeland  
Suzanne Guyer  
Varetta Hurt

Benny Lile  
Gary Mielcarek  
Eleanor Mills  
Henry Ormsby

Robert Sexton  
H. M. Snodgrass  
Roxie Tempus  
Maynard Thomas

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that with KDE staff working on activities associated with and reporting of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) results, the minutes for the September 12 meeting are not available for review at this meeting. He asked, with the committees approval, that the committee have the opportunity to approve the minutes at the next meeting.

Benny Lile advised committee members that there may be a need for a possible special meeting between now and the next scheduled meeting at the end of January 2004 to deal with additional NCLB issues. Kentucky Department of Education staff need more time between this committee's meeting and the State Board meeting to prepare and communicate the findings of this committee. The committee currently attempts to meet the week before a State Board meeting.

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble outlined the major changes in NCLB since the committee's last meeting. The State Board approved the use of the Commonwealth Accountability Testing system (CATS) as the other indicator for NCLB calculations. Originally Academic Index was proposed. Accountability Index permits the handling of the breadth of Kentucky core Content and permits desegregation of the key indicators of ethnicity, free/reduced lunch, disability and limited English proficiency. This also allows for safe harbor calculations. The Academic Index is much like the Accountability Index but excludes the non-academic components of attendance, retention, dropout and successful transition to adult life.

The department publicly shared the choice of academic index at District Assessment Coordinator meetings and received feedback that academic index would create the same problems that was experienced in the early KIRIS years. The department made the State Board aware and the Board decided that it would be better to use the CATS accountability index as one of the other NCLB indicators.

For a elementary school or middle school to meet the requirements for the NCLB other indicator one of three conditions must be met. A school or district must have (1) an accountability index above 80, or (2) have accountability index below 80 and above goal for the corresponding year, or (3) have an accountability index below goal and below 80 and the school is classified as improving.

To get results back to schools and districts and to meet the time requirements for NCLB, the previous year accountability index will be used. The department plans to have results to schools and districts by August 1. Graduation rate is also lagged one year. At the high school level the State Board changed criteria on meeting graduation rate. The Board set the 2014 graduation rate at 98 percent instead of 100 percent. The federal law for NCLB graduation does not recognize all students that graduate. The law does not recognize students with severe disabilities who receive a certificate of completion or students who graduate in five years. A school or district would not meet the other indicator if there is any slippage in the graduation rate.

In 2002 the graduation rate of 71 percent meets the requirement. In 2006, the graduation rate requirement is 80%. The grade rate increases each year by 2.25 percent until the rate reaches 98 percent in 2014. State statute says that in 2006 a school shall have a dropout rate of 5 percent or fewer or the school can not receive rewards.

People have not understood the significance of other academic indicators in the NCLB legislation. What has been missed is that there are three criteria to make Annual

Adequate Progress (AYP). First (1) schools and districts must test 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of students in subpopulations of sufficient size, second (2) show progress on the other academic indicator and third (3) meet all Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO's) in reading or mathematics.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile has a difficulty explaining why two Barren County schools who met the NCLB reading and mathematics goals were classified as not making AYP because their accountability index went down in 2002. Benny asked why does this override the “yes’s”?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that there is a section in federal regulation that sets out three conditions that must be met to make annual yearly progress. Condition one (1) is that you must test 95 percent of all your students and 95 percent of students in each subpopulation e.g. 95 percent of your Caucasian students, 95 percent of your African American students if you have sufficient size, which is 10 students in the grade range and 60 in the school. If you do not test students in your school to meet these requirements, then you do not make adequate yearly progress. Students must answer one multiple choice question and one open response question in reading and in mathematics. You can have 100 percent of your students proficient in reading and mathematics and you will not make adequate yearly progress if you do not meet the 95 percent participation rate. The second condition is meeting the accountability index for elementary and middle schools and graduation rate at the high school. A school must show progress on the other academic indicator. The federal legislation allows states to separate reading and mathematics once they meet the first and second condition. The State Board chose to look at reading and mathematics separately so schools shall meet an annual measurable objective in reading and an annual measurable object in mathematics.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus understanding is that to meet adequate yearly progress, all annual measurable objects have to be “yes”. Any “no” causes a school to not meet their adequate yearly progress.

Benny Lile asked what other states are doing for the other academic indicator?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that states are looking at things like percent advanced or distinguished performance, others are measuring attendance.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills wanted to confirm that a school is in serious NCLB trouble if it does not have 95 percent of its students participate in the test. Eleanor wanted clarification on students that are medically exempted from testing. Do they currently count in the participation rate and will these students need to be tested in future for participation rate calculations.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that the medically exempt students are not included in the 2003 participation rates. Proposed regulations will not have to students count in future years. However, the US Department of Education could over-rule this decision when they review Kentucky's regulations on NCLB.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills was very concerned about participation rate as schools need clear direction so that they are not ruled out of AYP because not enough students are tested.

Henry Ormsby asked for clarification what grades go into the participation rate.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that it is the current KCCT grade levels in reading and mathematics. When augmented testing is introduced in 2005 then participation will be grades end-of primary (grade 3) through grade 8, reading at grade 10 and mathematics at grade 11.

SCAAC member comments:

Roxie Tempus asked whether students who are incarcerated are tested. Benny Lile responded that the students are tested. Districts assign staff to these facilities providing education to the students and test the students.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that this is one of the most controversial subjects and the committee will be asked to comment later in the meeting. Students are tracked back to the high school.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills asked for confirmation that the student is included in the participation rate of the school testing the student and not in the receiving school.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble confirmed that this was correct. Schools are responsible for all students that appear on their rosters.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills asked if high schools are in NCLB calculations.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded yes and high schools by federal legislation must test students in grades 10 through 12 at least once in reading and once in mathematics. If schools are not receiving Title I funds then NCLB consequences do not apply. However, the district is impacted by the high school results as 175 of 176 Kentucky districts receive Title I funds. There is a parallel district accountability system under NCLB and consequences to districts apply.

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)****2b** Status of 2003 NCLB Assessment Results Reporting to  
Schools and Districts**Scott Trimble***KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble outlined the reporting of NCLB assessment results. Some schools received a AYP classification of question mark “???”. The department had one set of rules in place for testing LEP students in 2003 and then changed the rules for NCLB. The rule change affected participation rate and now included LEP students who formally were excluded. The department has sent a letter to the US Department of Education asking for a one time waiver for these schools as it is not fair to penalize them for the KDE decision.

Scott Trimble talked about why the NCLB results were delayed. The department had intended to release the results at the same time CATS results were released. Two mistakes were discovered when the department was ready to report. The 10-30 AMO student calculation and 10-60 participation rate were calculated within content area and were supposed to be calculated within grade. This caused an under-identification of schools who did not make AYP. Alternate portfolio student results should have been included and were not. Original data simulations did not include alternate portfolio students and the computer logic blocking alternate portfolio students was not removed when the final reports were produced. The data is in the hands of the school districts, is embargoed and will be publicly released on Monday. This does not permit us to talk about the results in this meeting.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Henry Ormsby points out that it is important that the average citizen understand the reasons why schools are not making adequate yearly progress.

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble advises that while he cannot provide details on individual schools and overall state results because of the embargo, it is safe to say that participation rate has not played a major role in AYP results, the other academic indicator and the annual measurable objectives in subpopulations contributed quite a bit to the AYP results.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Robert Sexton feels that to some degree this is not new information as we have already told the public that under CATS several hundred schools made their goal and several hundred did not make their goal. What is new about NCLB is whether or not they made their subpopulations.

Benny Lile advised that on Monday when the results are public, he will email committee members the complete media packet.

Kay Freeland is concerned that we are not playing on a level playing field. Schools with more subpopulations have significantly higher probabilities of failure than schools with no subpopulations. Kay provided a basketball slam dunk analogy. A school can provide all the skill training and practice to students on how to dunk a basketball. Because of other student limitations: height, weight, physical abilities, not every student is going to successfully dunk the basketball. Unfortunately, reality is that a student with disabilities having an I.Q. of 65 is not likely to be a Proficient student.

Henry Ormsby asked about other states and are they saying that these students can not learn and they are not going to deal with it.

Kay Freeland responds that other states expect these students to learn but set lower performance standard for all groups.

Maynard Thomas asked if the NCLB legislation has a requirement that a state cannot lower their standards just to come into compliance with NCLB.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that he does not believe it is in the legislation. The law does not allow for two standards, a state standard and a separate NCLB federal standard.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas responded that the issue is that there is not a national standard for proficiency. Kentucky set their standard before NCLB.

Kay Freeland points out that everyone is losing sight of reason for setting the standard. The purpose is a federal funding issue. This is the only purpose of No Child Left Behind.

**2c**

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)**  
Test Administration and Timely Score Reporting

**Scott Trimble**

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile introduces the issues of Timely Score Reporting and this committee is being asked to comment on test administration and timely score reporting alternatives.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reports that timely reporting is a big issue. The NCLB statute says that score results and adequate yearly progress decisions must be returned to the school/district prior to the beginning of the next school year. Kentucky has not done that because we have designed an assessment system that focuses on breadth of curriculum and depth in instructional mode. This translates to open response test questions. If we are going to test late in the school year we can not get tests scored by people and results back by beginning



of school year. Results were returned to schools within 150 days as required by state statute, which was September 30 for Spring 2003 testing.

We need to think about ways to get results back by the beginning of the school year or August 1. Three possible options are available to us. Scott presented the options from the least popular to most popular.

Option 3 – Do what we are going to do for 2004. Schools and districts will receive preliminary findings by August 1. Adequate yearly progress results are based on the multiple choice components of reading and mathematics and alternate portfolio scores, 2003 and 2002 accountability indexes for elementary and middle schools, and 2003 and 2002 graduation rates for high schools. If your school has failed to make adequate yearly progress in reading or mathematics for two consecutive years then you have to offer students school of choice. This is a preliminary decision and not the final decision. In October final AYP results, which include reading, and mathematics open response results are reported with the CATS results. Simulations that we have been able to run, which were not perfect simulations show that 80 to 90 percent agreement between the preliminary results and the October 1 final results. For consequences schools are held to the preliminary findings and have to offer services even if the October final findings change. Alternate portfolio scores are part of the preliminary decision. The testing window remains where it currently is.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby wants confirmation that parents will have less than two weeks to make a school of choice decision if schools receive results on August 1 and the school year starts August 15.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded yes and it could be less time as many schools start around August 6.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland asked for clarification on school choice. Are only students in the subpopulation not meeting the annual measurable objective offered school choice or is it offered to all students?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that school choice is for all students. AYP consequences apply to the whole school, not just the affected subpopulation.

SCAAC member comments:

Margie Bradford asked about Independent school districts who often only have one school at the grade level. Will students be allowed to transfer to schools in a surrounding district?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that this is not a requirement of the NCLB legislation. KDE is asking districts to make a good faith effort with another district to permit student transfers.

Scott Trimble outlined the next option:

Option 2 – In 2005 the number of forms in the assessment will be reduced, probably to three forms or less. There are fewer open response questions and in there would be in-school and in-state scoring of the open response questions. Teachers would score the assessments before the assessments are sent to the testing contractor. There probably will only be one form. The testing window will not change which is the last week of April. This plan will require teacher training on how to score the reading and mathematics open response questions. We will need to ask teachers if they can do this and if they are willing to do this and what conditions they are willing to do the scoring. The multiple choice would stay at six forms, the open response would be only one.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked if this will require 1,500 teachers to do the scoring. The training will have to be in place and completed prior to the Spring 2005 administration which is a concern.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded with a yes and a number of people are concerned about training 1,500 teachers by 2005.

SCAAC member comments:

Varetta Hurt asked teachers about scoring and she wanted to know how much harder is it to score open response questions versus the writing portfolio.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded standards and benchmarks for the writing portfolio are already established and well known and not specific to each portfolio. For open response currently the scoring rubric is specific to each open response item.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass feels that this would be a very valuable in service or staff development activity for teachers to score the assessment.

Benny Lile pointed out that you would release the items every year as the form has been scored by over 1,500 Kentucky teachers. A teacher then knows how each student did on the item.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble points out a shortcoming of this option is that it can be viewed as narrowing the curriculum as there are only six open response questions in reading and six in mathematics; not the current 36 in each content area. Teachers will need to understand that these items are part of a broader set of items and not teach to just this set of content.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas and H. M. Snodgrass point out that in addition to teachers there are students who have graduated and received their teaching certificate and recently retired teachers that could/would score the assessment.

Benny Lile asked Scott Trimble to describe Option 1.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble said that Option 1 leaves the six forms of the test intact. The testing window would be moved back to the last 2 weeks of April. Reading and mathematics test components are scored by contractor first. The contractor possibly would open two testing scoring sites in Kentucky. Reading and mathematics multiple choice and open response scoring and alternate portfolio scores are complete by July 17 with release to schools and districts by August 1.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile indicated that previous discussions that he was part of required moving the testing window to the months of February / March. This is not a lot different than what we currently have. Can the contractor meet the schedule with a test administration the last week two weeks of April.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that the contractor thinks that it can be done. Having the testing window in February / March is too early in year. The State Board wants to protect the integrity of the current accountability system, test as late as feasible in the school year and get results to schools and districts by August 1.

SCAAC member comments:

Eleanor Mills reminds the committee that offering school choice does not mean that all students will have the opportunity to change schools. NCLB provides specific directions on determining the priority and process that schools will follow to allow students to transfer to another school in the district. There is a first priority for specific students; the average students, SES disadvantaged students and at risk students. Schools may not have the slots to receive students.

Benny Lile reported on the last State Board meeting. His perception is that the Board subcommittee on assessment and accountability did not appear favorable to Option 2 as a viable option. They appeared apprehensive to the teachers scoring based on the additional workload. And more apprehensive in reducing the number of test forms almost to point of being adamant. The concern is the perception of narrowing the curriculum. The subcommittee was not aghast in moving the test window to the February or March time period.

Henry Ormsby felt it is important to do what is the least disruption to students. If you can predict with a 90 percent confidence level, you can identify where your problems are and

get ahead of the PR (Public Relations) issue are. While Henry is not speaking in favor of any of the three, Option 3 seems to provide the least disruption in the schools.

Suzanne Guyer points out under Option 1 moving the testing window to late April is not different than what happened a couple of years ago.

Robert Sexton asked clarification of Option 1 and losing teaching days.

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble advises that the testing window would be moved forward one week from the current schedule and all testing would be condensed into a single two week testing window. Under the current schedule the last testing window ends May 21.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Suzanne Guyer in her discussions with teachers, there was not a great ground swell to score tests. Some of the reasons given by teachers for not wanting to score include: personal life, family obligations, graduate work, improvement of their professional careers, and not wanting to be out of the classroom. Maybe having two forms where one is scored by teachers accomplishes many of the positives of Option 2.

*OEA staff comments:*

Jerry Lunney shares that there is great difficulty in developing writing prompts. Authors charge big for passages. Can the test scoring be distributed to teachers homes for scoring?

*KDE staff comments:*

Scott Trimble responded that the state of Utah experimented with distributing test items to homes. Scott does not know how successful they were. Some of the issues that were difficult to deal with were requirements of personal computers having certain qualities, particular screen size and resolution and security issues at the local level and as the information travels across the internet. We tried it last year in Louisville at a single site. We had some difficulty attracting teachers to participate, even at 9 to 10 dollars an hour.

*SCAAC member comments:*

Varetta Hurt reminds the committee that teachers are positive towards instate scoring.

Henry Ormsby summarizes that teachers and superintendents sound excited about doing option 2. But this will not be a viable alternative if instate scoring costs several million dollars a year.

H. M. Snodgrass recommended that a hybrid model be developed using parts of Option 2 where pilots are initially run and scoring of the tests by Kentucky teachers are phased in.

3	<b>Formulate technical and other questions for comment by National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA)</b>	<b>Benny Lile</b>
---	--	-------------------

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that a 1:00 p.m. telephone conference call with James Catterall and John Poggio, co-chairs of the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability has been scheduled. The purpose of the call was to allow this committee to ask questions and receive technical advise on assessment issues. When formulating questions, NTAPAA will defer on policy questions. Technical questions will assist us in making policy recommendations.

The committee then identified five areas to ask NTAPAA for technical advise.

1. If teachers score the assessment in 2005, what effect does that have on equating the test from previous years? Does the clock stop and we start over with scales? Is there any impact to test validity and reliability? Will test results be affected in future years when teachers scoring the test see the test and then teach to the test?
2. How does the number of forms impact the validity and reliability of the test? The three options presented continues with six forms of the test, reduces the number of forms to three and another option only has one form.
3. What affect does a hybrid form of scoring have on test validity and reliability?
4. If the scoring window is moved what impact does this have on the current test and test results?
5. Does one definition of academic year for CATS and NCLB affect test reliability? How many students would be excluded under the new definition? If we are permitted to have two definitions for academic year, one for NCLB and one for CATS, will this affect test validity and reliability?

The committee then discussed further having two academic year definitions.

Benny Lile then briefed everyone on SCAAC's discussion with Local Superintendents Advisory Committee (LSAC) on a consensus definition of academic year. Both groups presented to the State Board at the last meeting. LSAC's defined academic year as a student who is continuously enrolled in the school from the sixth day of school to the end of the testing window. SCAAC academic year definition is a student enrolled in the school 100 cumulative days and is enrolled on the first day of testing. The State Board asked that the two groups meet and present again at the December State Board meeting.

Maynard Thomas and Benny Lile met with LSAC. Maynard advised that LSAC was committed to the LSAC definition. There was no common ground and no discussion. LSAC is most interested in including as many students to get funding and as few as possible for accountability.

The committee then had discussion on the impact of a common definition for CATS and NCLB and separate definitions for CATS and NCLB.

Benny Lile felt that this committee had agreed to a common academic year definition for CATS and NCLB and that it should be the 100 cumulative definition.

Robert Sexton felt that if we had to have two definitions then pick the longest window as possible. This is a great frustration because each state sets its own standards and will exclude a different number of students.

Maynard Thomas is concerned about the confusion on the part of the general public if there are two definitions.

Kay Freeland stated that the overall AYP outcome may have a economic impact on a Kentucky school district or a geographic region within Kentucky. Corporations will look at AYP results as one indicator on locating business in that area. The decision on inclusion and exclusion of students will ultimately impact the AYP results for that school and impact economic development.

The consensus of committee members is that this committee wants to exclude from accountability as few students as possible.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble added that the State Board is very concerned about excluding students from accountability.

---

At 12:07 p.m. the committee began a lunch break.  
The meeting was reconvened at approximately 12:54 p.m.

---

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the meeting.

H.M. Snodgrass asked if his district would be accountable for students from other districts that are served by his district's day treatment program.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that what is being proposed for A3 through A6 schools will depend on who places the student in the school. If an A1 school places the student in the alternative setting, then the A1 school placing the student will be accountable for the student. If the student is placed in the A3-A6 school through adjudication (courts, social services, etc.) or the student is self-placed then the student's results will roll up into the district providing the services and also roll up into an aggregate state system. This committee has previously recommended this approach. Another dimension that has not been talked about much is that the A3, A5 and A6 schools have special missions different than the regular A1 school. In addition to this type of accountability, these schools need to identify some additional indicators that are related to their mission. So if a school focuses on students with behavior problems then the school might have an indicator related to reduction of violence. We have previously talked about this in going to the district

Kay Freeland stated her district has two or three residential treatment centers. For many of the students it is their last resort. Many have never been school. Most are court ordered. You are saying that at the district level we are going to have to assume those scores? This is so unfair.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that there are three options on the table: 1) Hold the district accountability that is providing services to the adjudicated students. 2) Track the data back to sending district. 3) Roll the student data up and make someone at the state level accountable. What is currently written into the proposed regulation is a combination of survey district and state accountability.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby asked if at a future meeting department staff could provide student counts by geographic region and grade levels (high school, middle school, elementary) for this population of students.

Benny Lile feels that this does not increase accountability. This only creates anger and bitterness towards the entire accountability system.

H.M. Snodgrass recommends that the results for the residential treatment centers be rolled to the State.

Benny Lile's opinion is that more will be accomplished to improve education for this population of students if you have a state report. These student performance results are diluted now.

Henry Ormsby feels that a different accountability system needs to be developed for these students. The students are not in the normal classroom setting and because of their setting can not receive the normal number of hours of education that a normal student receives.

4	<b>Telephone Conference Call with NTAPAA Committee Members</b>	<b>NTAPAA</b>
---	--	---------------

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile introduces James Catterall and John Poggio who are co-chairs of the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) James and John are participating via telephone.

The committee has a number of questions that will revolve around two main categories. The first item deals with full academic year and this committee realizes that this is a State Board policy issue. We would like to put one proposal that this committee has made for your comment. We would like to have a common definition for CATS and NCLB and that common definition would be the 100 cumulative days. The student needs to be a member of a school and/or district for 100 cumulative days before your score counts in the index. If 100 day cumulative days definition were adopted for CATS assessment how will that impact the current policy of a one day full academic year. If the student is enrolled on the first day of the testing window then the school is accountable for the student. Under the 100 day rule, we will take a number of students out of the accountability index. At what point does that movement invalidate what we are doing.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall asked if Scott Trimble and his staff have done any simulations to determine the number of students that will be impacted.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that none have been conducted. With the data the department has, and using a matching routine, matching across years statewide about 15 percent of the students are lost. Some students did not match because of the matching criteria we used. The current system does not provide a way for us to determine the number of days a student has been at a school.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio asked if it was possible to do empirically where you pick a grade a content area, it should be reading it should be mathematics at a grade where there is confidence in the quality of the scores. A middle level grade in reading or mathematics probably is appropriate and go back this past years data and try to get the number of days the student was in the environment of the school and try to do that statewide on voluntary basis. Then address the question empirically, students that were there within seven days of the test window. What was their average score like, two weeks and what was their average score, three weeks. This will permit evaluating the relationship between the time in the district and performance on CATS. Even for one grade and one content area, this will be an enormous effort. John wanted to know if this is something we would want to do.



KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that this is something we would want to do. He does not feel there is anyway that we would get it done.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall had some ideas. Requiring students enrolled for 100 days before taking CATS will result in better attribution of CATS scores to the school. If you have the uniform requirement for CATS and adequate yearly progress for NCLB there will be more alignment and consistency between the NCLB determination and the CATS determination. The scores will move together, more than they would under the existing system. Who are the mobile students? If the mobile students tend to be the ones that are spun out and mobile students tend to be lower achievers from some reason, then the CATS score likely to go up a bit. This is only conjecture on James part.

John Poggio reported that his state does capture how long the student has been in the district. Not at the refined level of days, months, but has the student been here a year, less than a year, a year to two years, two years or longer. He does not know how close Kentucky and Kansas are, but there are dramatic differences in the level of performance of students if enrolled less than a year, a year to two years, and two years and more. For students who have been in the same school district, not the same school building, do very meaningfully better than those who are there a year or less. The affect sizes are very real. From a data point of view John would fully expect the rule mentioned would lead to a increase in the accountability indices if you only test students there 100 days or more. Does the 100 day definition mean that the student will be there on the order of about  $\frac{3}{4}$ 's of a school year.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile responded that with all the different school starting dates it would average to 70 percent of the school year.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio felt that NTAPAA should visit the question "At what point do you have a validity problem?". At this point John felt the only validity problem Kentucky will have is changing the index over time because the population has changed. John holds the opinion, which he has shared with the State Board, is that the Kentucky rule to count a child on the day they show up is to strong a force for accountability at the local level. Never the less, it becomes a policy question even though it has been stated as a validity question. John feels that there will be a bounce in the progress of the local school that maybe more attributable to the attenuation, the shrinking of the data pool as opposed to improvement in CATS. This is the validity question in John's mind. There has been adjustments when KIRIS went to CATS with the change in cut scores. A bounce in improvement as a function of a more achievement based sample is now representing the schools because of the mobility factor being removed.

James Catterall advised that there will be several decisions to be made as part of adapting to or including NCLB's requirements that will have either suspected or unknown influences on Kentucky's index. The 100 day requirement will have some affect. Do to changes that NCLB is going to bring on, you should be able to tolerate this and Kentucky can choose to do a baseline reset or to tolerate the noise of the data.

John Poggio doesn't know how you would make the adjustment retroactively to take out the affect without doing a tremendous amount of work. You would have to go back to 1999 and 2000 data and reconstruct the student population based on the 100 day rule. It may not be worth all the time and effort to make the correction. Simply take it to the good and get on with it. You will end up in the same place with the Spring 2004 data. There is noise in the sense the data is bad. You will not know if the change is function of the attrition in the sample in addition to change in learning which we should expect. This truly could be a multi-million dollar project.

James Catterall indicated that this could help urban districts as they have more student mobility. Turning this around, urban schools test a lot of students that have not been there very long. They have not been the ones that have educating the students so this change will impact districts differently, it may bring more fairness to a school that has high mobility that is now being assessed for students that it has not been able to teach.

#### SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile introduced the next major topic, timely reporting results. The issue is the time when the test is administered and when schools must get results back under NCLB. Scott Trimble laid out three options to the committee. Option 3 is leaving the six forms in tact, moving the window back one week, two scoring sites in Kentucky. The contractor would score reading and mathematics first and get data back to the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) in early July. Option 2 is to reduce the number of forms to three or less and do instate scoring. A committee member asked if we have to reduce the number of forms with this option. Option 1 is what we are doing for 2004 where preliminary results based on multiple choice in reading and mathematics which will be delivered to the schools and districts in the summer and complete reports in October based on the full open response. In Option 2 the committee talked about a hybrid or a phased system where the contractor scoring three of the forms and Kentucky teachers, perhaps new teachers who have just graduated from universities and recently retired teachers handling the scoring.

Some of the questions that have come from the membership are: Is there an issue with teachers grading the forms if we do not release the form after scoring? If the items continue to be included in our test, what type of issue do we have if we have widespread teacher scoring of the items. Also considering that teachers write these question?

#### NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall responded that NTAPAA as a panel looked at these questions and that there was some investigation that would need to be done before they could make a recommendation. For instance, on option 2 reducing the number of forms to three we had

questions about the degree of content coverage that would remain and what likely changes would do to the nature of the test. Option 3 leaving the six forms in tact and moving the testing window back a week is pushing on the contractor to provide reading and mathematics earlier, NTAPAA suggested that there be tough discussions with the contractor on whether it could be done or not. The issue of preliminary results utilizing multiple choice lends itself to the kinds of analysis looking at the difference between what the results would be or would have been on existing testing data using multiple choice and then rolling in the open response items. Regarding teacher scoring, if you do not renew items, that the item is used in future tests, there is a risk that teachers may teach to the test. A second issue is having teachers score the exam rather than outside contractors who are trained people that are not attached to a participle school. In the past we have seen some issues with the writing portfolio who are scored by teachers. Those issues have narrowed in recent years. Will the scoring be uniform and not biased.

John Poggio felt that Kentucky must wrestle with the question of development of new performance items and the introduction of new performance items on an annual basis to serve as a benchmark against that kind of thing. You have to know the threat is there and you have plan how you are going to monitor and evaluate. The reuse of items is a luxury, but it is a luxury that is not necessarily supported by the statistics. The performance assessment in Kentucky are not directly equated, they stand apart, they are computed and everyone assumes that they are equated.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked for clarification. Is NTAPAA saying that we should forget teacher scoring? If we stay the way we are today, could be releasing forms and generating new forms.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio thinks it is a wonderful idea to have teacher scoring as that is what NTAPAA thinks education and testing should do. You could be releasing forms and generating new forms.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble pointed out that the test is equated year to year on the multiple choice component of a form. We equate across forms and put all the forms on the same scale with all items including the multiple choice. If the linking form attributes change across years this will impact the equating. This would have to be confirmed with CTB. Scott does have a concern that it would be possible to successfully train and have teachers accurately score 30 to 36 open response questions in each content area. If the number of forms are reduced, the test developers have told us coverage of a content area would be reduced.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked James and John about the impact of moving testing window. The testing window has been moved later in the year and the number of testing windows has been expanded allowing schools to have choice. Now we are talking about compacting the

window and moving it a few weeks earlier in the year. What impact does this have on validity issues?

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall responded that this is a very viable option as it allows for continuing six forms. The only issue is pushing up against spring break. Alternatively the closer the testing window is to summer break, the less motivated the students may be.

SCAAC member comments:

Henry Ormsby asked about the first question and how we define academic school year and how we define 100. From a technical point of view for a Kentucky CATS can we report the results base on the 100 day definition of the academic school year and then for the No Child Left Behind report the results on a different definition of the academic school year.

Benny Lile elaborated that this committee's recommendation to the State Board is to have a common definition of academic school year for CATS and NCLB. If the State Board chooses to go a different direction, from a technical point of view do we have an issue if we have one academic year definition for CATS another academic year definition for NCLB.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio advised that there is no technical issue.

James Catterall responded that the question is what impact it might have on the differential between the two sets of scores on how they are received publicly and in the education community.

John Poggio indicated that there could be interpretation error with reporting two sets of results. Steps will have to be taken to assure that the public and users are well advised as to what the properties of each are, what the complements might be between the systems and how they are different. They cannot be easily or readily mixed and matched.

James Catterall pointed out that were you to use the current definition for CATS and the 100 day rule for NCLB, a school with high mobility could look 25 percent better on NCLB.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton asked for a confirmation that even with a common definition of 100 days for CATS and NCLB, schools with high mobility could see a one year jump in scores of 25 percent where as schools with stable student populations may see no change. This is a political problem but there are not validity issues.

NTAPAA member comments:

John Poggio added that the shift should be only a one time shift for schools with transient populations since one should anticipate that these schools will continue to see high student mobility in future years. However this factor may not remain constant over time as

geographic and economic characteristics of the school will change. An example is a school moving from a agrarian base student population to a suburban population.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked James and John to comment on preliminary and final reporting approach where preliminary results are based on reading and mathematics multiple choice and final results having the open response rolled in.

NTAPAA member comments:

James Catterall said that assumption since testing in 1992 has been that you get a more complete and well rounded read of student performance, capacity and knowledge by including open response items. If you make some result where importance is based on only multiple choice you are saying that you are willing to give up some of that information that you found valuable in the system in the past and to make a determination based only on a more limited set of barometers. The second issue is that if you have differences between preliminary and final results that are beyond the federal deadline, James is not sure how that will work out. The differences that emerge there are only going to raise questions, which is more of a political question.

John Poggio going back to the last question may have a slight difference of opinion with James. If you go to a two tier reporting system initially only with multiple choice and then augmented or adjusted the finding with open response, if there is data to suggest that the level of relationship is strong between the multiple choice and performance scores that a building would obtain, then he is less reticent about going forward with that kind of plan. This plan serves interests well, it allows you to maintain the system without changing deadlines and it allows coverage of the content.

James Catterall agrees with John's comments.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that while we have attempted at the building level to compare performance of multiple choice results and rolled in open response results we do not have multiple choice results on the same scale. The simulation scenarios that were run are showing 80 to 90 percent consistency of decision.

	<b>No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)</b> Council review of definitions of Academic Year, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), Participate Rate, Annual Measure Objectives (AMO) and Confidence Intervals	<b>Scott Trimble</b>
--	--	----------------------

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked the members to come to closure on the full academic issue. To summarize what Benny heard and the committee still has a decision of recommending a

100 day definition for both CATS and NCLB. Benny heard that NTAPAA feels that it is attainable. If the State Board makes the decision to leave CATS as it is, then do we have a second definition?

H. M. Snodgrass recommends that this committee yield to LSAC. It doesn't matter at that point.

### **SCAAC MOTION**

Kay Freeland made the motion that if the State Board chooses to stay with the first day of testing for CATS, then NCLB moves to the 6<sup>th</sup> day of school. The motion was seconded by H. M. Snodgrass.

Benny Lile stated that we have a motion and a second that says if there will be two definitions for CATS and NCLB concerning full academic year and the definition for NCLB will be enrollment from the 6<sup>th</sup> day of school until the last day of testing.

Kay Freeland - Question has been called for. All in favor of the motion as presented signify by saying aye. All opposed say ney (none). Motion passes as presented.

#### **SCAAC member comments:**

Benny Lile asked the committee to make a motion on a selection of the three options for test administration and timely score reporting. To summarize what Benny has perceived, NTAPAA feels that any of the three options are accomplishable. Benny understands that options one and three are least disrupting with the current testing system.

Robert Sexton said that NTAPAA had the most concerns about option 2.

Cindy Owen reported that H. M. Snodgrass had to leave but wanted the committee to know that he supports options 2 and 3.

### **SCAAC MOTION**

Robert Sexton made the motion to adopt option 3, the first option that Scott Trimble presented which is the multiple reporting

Benny Lile confirms that is the multiple reporting option with multiple choice first and then open response later.

Robert Sexton actually prefers Option 1 but given the testing window issues that have been raised that seems to be a substantial objection from a school standpoint. Option 2 we spent most of the day talking about problems with that. Option 2 is the most complex of all the options. He recommends that Option 2 be studied as the professional development arguments are very strong.

Benny Lile states that we have a motion to adopt option 3 multiple reporting, multiple choice first with open response to come later with two determinations. A preliminary determination with multiple choice and final determination with open response rolled in.

Suzanne Guyer seconded the motion.

**Discussion:**

Maynard Thomas still leans more toward option 1. We should investigate with teachers about earlier testing.

Benny Lile advised that option 3 does not change the testing window.

Eleanor Mills recommended that the committee go with option 3 and have KDE continue to explore the option of in state scoring.

Benny Lile confirmed with Robert Sexton that this could be added to the motion and Robert concurred.

Benny Lile called for a roll call because the voice vote was not unanimous. The motion passed 8 to 3 with member voting as follows:

Margie T. Bradford – yes	Benny Lile – no	Robert Sexton - yes
Kay Freeland – yes	Gary Mielcarek - yes	Roxie Tempus - yes
Suzanne Guyer – yes	Eleanor Mills - no	Maynard Thomas - no
Varetta D. Hurt – yes	Henry Ormsby - yes	

**2e**

**No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)**  
Proposed KBE Regulations for Council Review

**Scott Trimble**

**SCAAC member comments:**

Benny Lile asked the committee to review the proposed regulation on A3-A6 schools – 703 KAR 5:040. The particular language referred to is on page 6 line 10 – students placed in a A3, A5, or A6 school by the court or a governmental agency, a A1 school other than the student's home A1 school or self placed. That student's data shall be attributed to the district providing the educational services for accountability purposes. Benny recommends that this committee have a recommendation and motion

Kay Freeland thought that this had been previously discussed and this committee recommended that the students be accountable at the state level.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen reported that the committee's recommendation was taken forward. Cindy and Scott were advised that the accountability decision should be closer to the students attending the A3, A5, or A6 school level. This is a compromise to place at the district level.

SCAAC member comments:

Beny Lile asked Roger Ervin to locate the motion from the previous meeting. Roger Ervin read the committee's motion from the September 27, 2002 meeting:

SCAAC Motion:

H.M. Snodgrass moves that we adopt this position in principal. Obviously the details will have to be worked out. The motion is seconded by Maynard Thomas. Benny Lile reiterates for the committee that when schools are directly responsible for the placement of the students in a non-A1 setting, the A1 school should be accountable for that student. All other settings should be considered under another form of accountability. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

The committee then revisited the non-A1 issues that they covered in previous meetings. In general the committee felt that accountability needed to follow the money.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas was at an advisory council for gifted education meeting that also was attended by Roxie Tempus it was brought to their attention the changes to a policy on promotional practices is being looked at. It reads if a student assigned to a higher grade results in skipping a grade within the accountability system, the student shall participate in the assessment component associated with the grade being passed through i.e. students participating in elementary, middle and high school assessments components. The scenario given to Roxie and I was a student who is double promoted from end-of-primary to the fifth grade is expected to take both the grade 4 and grade 5 assessment.

Benny Lile reminded committee members at the winter meeting that Maynard had to miss, we discussed this. This is not a wide spread issue. When Dale Campbell was still with us, he described how high schools could cause students to bypass grade 11 testing based on promotion policies at the high school level. This committee may want to re-look at this in relation to gifted and talented students.



Benny Lile asked Roger Ervin to look up the motion. Following is the motion from the January 27, 2003 committee meeting.

SCAAC Motion:

Linda Sheffield made the motion that SCAAC adopt the KAAC recommendation to the Kentucky Department of Education that double promoted students be tested at both grade levels and a specific waiver process be added to the policy where schools can apply for a waiver.

Dale Campbell and Eleanor Mills seconded the motion.

There was no discussion, the committee voted, and the motion passed unanimously.

Benny Lile and Scott Trimble mentioned that they forgot about the waiver issue. The State Board has yet to take up the proposed changes to the regulation so the waiver can be added to the regulation.

Maynard Thomas reminded everyone that the minutes are not current on the KDE website and this issue may not have come up had they been posted.

Benny Lile asked committee members to look at their calendars and would a meeting on January 16, 2004 work for the members. Members discussed a couple of alternative dates and agreed to meet Friday January 16, 2004.

Benny Lile asked that the writing issue be an agenda item for the next meeting. The general assembly will come together in January. He would like to discuss time spent on developing portfolios, discrepancies, scoring accuracy, discrepancy between on-demand and writing portfolio scores and everything in between.

Eleanor Mills reminded Benny Lile that we have three open positions. Eleanor also asked about when the meeting in March would take place. Benny suggested the second Friday in March, which is March 12, 2004.

Maynard would like to have on-demand and writing portfolio data available for the January meeting.

KDE staff comments:

Cindy Owen asked if she could share some National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) results with the committee. In 2003 our reading 4<sup>th</sup> grade score was 219 and the nation was at 216. We have 31 percent of our 4<sup>th</sup> graders at or above the proficient mark and the nation is 30 percent. At the grade our reading scale score is 266

and the nation is 261. We have 34 percent of our students proficient and above and the nation is 30 percent.

**2003 NAEP SCALE SCORES - 4<sup>TH</sup>- AND 8<sup>TH</sup>-GRADE READING**

YEAR	4 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE KENTUCKY	4 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE NATION	8 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE KENTUCKY*	8 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE NATION*
1998	218	213	262	261
2002	219	217	265	263
2003	219	216	266	261

In mathematics from 2000 to 2003 our 4<sup>th</sup> grade scale score has improved from 219 to 239. The nation also went up 10 scale score points. Kentucky's percent proficient or advanced in 4<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics is 22 percent and the nation is 32 percent. At the 8<sup>th</sup> grade we have 24 percent and the nation has 27 percent. All this data is on NAEP's website.

**2003 NAEP SCALE SCORES - 4<sup>TH</sup>- AND 8<sup>TH</sup>-GRADE MATHEMATICS**

YEAR	4 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE KENTUCKY	4 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE NATION	8 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE KENTUCKY*	8 <sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCALE SCORE NATION*
2000	219	224	270	272
2003	229	234	274	276

**ADJOURNMENT**

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised that since there is no longer a member quorum, there cannot be a motion to adjourn the meeting. Benny Lile ended the meeting at approximately 3:30 p.m.